

REMARKS

A. Reopening of Prosecution

By this paper, Applicants re-open prosecution in this Reply to the Final Action of March 21, 2011, and respectfully request reconsideration of the application. Applicants intend that the claims as now pending be interpreted under the ordinary interpretation understood in the art. Applicants hereby rescind, and no longer intend that the claims be limited by, any assertion, statement, argument, amendment or other action in this patent application, or any application whose file history is available for use in interpreting any patent issuing on this application, that might be taken to be a surrender or disclaimer of any subject matter from the scope of any claim. No such assertion, statement, argument, amendment or any other action in this application or in any such available application should be taken as a surrender or disclaimer from, and may not be used to interpret, any claim of this patent, or any claim of any patent to which such Applicants' file histories may be pertinent.

Applicants hereby request that the Examiner re-visit any previous surrender, disclaimer or characterization of claims, and re-visit any prior art that may have been avoided or intended to be avoided by such surrender, disclaimer or characterization. In addition, a new search is requested.

B. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

On page 2, the Final Action rejected claims 12-16, 18-22 and 30-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph 2, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The rejection is moot in light of the claim amendments.

C. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

On page 5, the Final Action rejected claims 12-16, 18-22, 30-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,134,535 (“Belzberg”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,297,031 (“Gutterman”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,438,575 (“Khan”).

For example, independent claims [] states:

D. General Comments on Dependent Claims

Since each of the dependent claims depends from a base claim that is believed to be in condition for allowance, Applicants believe that it is unnecessary at this time to argue the allowability of each of the dependent claims individually. However, Applicants do not necessarily concur with the interpretation of the dependent claims as set forth in the Office Action, nor do Applicants concur that the basis for the rejection of any of the dependent claims is proper. Therefore, Applicants reserve the right to specifically address the patentability of the dependent claims in the future, if deemed necessary.

E. Authorization for Email Communication

Recognizing that Internet communications are not secure, Applicants hereby authorize the USPTO to communicate with any authorized representative concerning any subject matter of this application by electronic mail. Applicants understand that a copy of these communications will be made of record in the application file.

F. Conclusion

In general, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney can be reached at the address shown below. All telephone calls should be directed to the undersigned at (857) 413-2056.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 21, 2011

_____/Ruth J. Ma/_____

Customer No: 63710
Innovation Group
Cantor Fitzgerald, LLP
110 E. 59th Street
New York, NY 10002

Ruth J. Ma, Reg. No. 55,414
Attorney for Applicant
Tel. No. (857) 413-2056
Fax. No. (857) 413-2019